

## FISH &amp; RICHARDSON P.C.

Frederick P. Fish  
1855-1930W.K. Richardson  
1859-1951

## BY ELECTRONIC FILING

August 4, 2006

Suite 1100  
919 N. Market Street  
P.O. Box 1114  
Wilmington, Delaware  
19899-1114Telephone  
302 652-5070Facsimile  
302 652-0607Web Site  
[www.fr.com](http://www.fr.com)

The Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.  
 United States District Court  
 844 North King Street  
 Wilmington, DE 19801

Re: NICE Systems, Inc. and NICE Systems Ltd. v. Witness Systems, Inc.  
 Civil Action No. 06-311

FR

ATLANTA

AUSTIN

BOSTON

DALLAS

DELAWARE

NEW YORK

SAN DIEGO

SILICON VALLEY

TWIN CITIES

WASHINGTON, DC

Dear Judge Farnan:

I am writing to request that the Rule 16 Scheduling Conference in this action, currently set for Thursday, September 7, 2006, be rescheduled for a later date. We ask for postponement because lead counsel for Witness Systems, Inc., Mr. Setty, and other key members of his litigation team, will be participating on September 7<sup>th</sup> in a *Markman* hearing in the closely-related action, *Witness Systems, Inc. v. NICE Systems, Inc. and NICE Systems Ltd.*, No. 1:04-CV-2531-CAP (referred to in the motion papers as “*NICE II*”), pending in the Northern District of Georgia.<sup>1</sup> Former Judge McKelvie is acting as a special master in *NICE I* and *II* and, in that capacity, conducted the *Markman* hearing in *NICE I* on July 27<sup>th</sup>.

We believe it would be efficient and logical to present oral argument on defendant’s pending Motion for Transfer (D.I. No. 13) to the Court at the time of the initial Scheduling Conference. Mr. Setty would like to present that argument since he is intimately familiar with the related Georgia cases that figure prominently in the transfer analysis.

We conferred with opposing counsel regarding a modest postponement of the Scheduling Conference, but they would not agree to join in the request for rescheduling unless defendant agreed to open discovery in spite of the pending Motion for Transfer,<sup>2</sup> notwithstanding their participation in the same September

<sup>1</sup> As discussed more fully in Defendant Witness Systems, Inc.’s Brief in Support of its Motion for Transfer (D.I. No. 15), three earlier-filed actions, involving the same technologies and products at issue in this action, are currently pending between Witness Systems and NICE Systems in the Northern District of Georgia.

<sup>2</sup> Defendant maintains that it is inappropriate, under *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Polin*, 429 F.2d 30 (3d Cir. 1970), to open discovery in this case before the pending Motion to Transfer is decided. See Defendant’s Letter to the Court filed July 13, 2006 (D.I. No. 21).

The Honorable Joseph J. Farnan Jr.  
July 13, 2006  
Page 2

7<sup>th</sup> *Markman* hearing in *NICE II*. Defendant therefore asks that the Court reschedule the Conference to a later date agreeable to all parties. In that regard, Mr. Setty will be out of the country from September 13-23, but will use his best efforts to make himself available on any other date the Court is able to schedule the Rule 16 Conference.

Respectfully yours,

*/s/ William J. Marsden, Jr.*

William J. Marsden, Jr.

WJM:jrm

cc: Josy W. Ingersoll, Esq. (via email)